```
1
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                                             23-CR-134(VSB)
               V.
5
     CHARLES BRISCOE,
6
                    Defendant.
 7
      -----x
 8
                                              New York, N.Y.
9
                                              February 16, 2024
                                              10:00 a.m.
10
     Before:
11
                        HON. VERNON S. BRODERICK,
12
                                              District Judge
13
                               APPEARANCES
14
     DAMIAN WILLIAMS
15
          United States Attorney for the
          Southern District of New York
16
     KEVIN MEAD
          Assistant United States Attorney
17
     FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF NEW YORK
18
          Attorneys for Defendant
     BY: IAN MARCUS AMELKIN
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

THE COURT: You may be seated. If I could ask counsel to please identify themselves for the record.

MR. MEAD: Good morning, your Honor. AUSA Kevin Mead appearing for the government.

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Good morning, your Honor. Ian

Marcus Amelkin of the Federal Defenders of New York on behalf

of Mr. Briscoe. I would like to introduce members of

Mr. Briscoe's family who traveled here this morning. First,

his wife, who is present right there in purple; his mother, who

traveled from Arkansas to be with us; as well as his aunt, who

is also here. And you received letters from many of them.

THE COURT: I did, yes. Okay. So this matter is on today for sentencing. Mr. Briscoe, if at any point in time you don't understand something that I've said, or if you would like some additional time to speak with your attorney, just let me know, and I'll give you the time you need to speak to your attorney or I'll try and answer whatever question you might have. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. First, as an initial matter, I want to review for the parties the materials I've received and read in connection with today's sentencing. So I've received and read the presentence investigation report, which was initially prepared on January 2 of 2024 and revised on

January 29 of 2024. I've received the defense submission, which is a letter dated February 5, 2024, which contains various attachments, including letters from Mr. Briscoe, his mother and father, his sister—in—law, his wife, his father—in—law, a friend of his, certain medical records that relate to a flare up of his diverticulitis, a letter from school relating to his volunteer work, and some statistics relating to the sentencing guidelines relating to the Southern District of New York. I've also received the government's letter of February 8 of 2024, and the letter of, I think it's Athlete—2; is that correct, Mr. Mead?

MR. MEAD: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: A letter from Athlete-2, who is a victim. Let me ask first, have each of the parties received those documents?

MR. MEAD: Yes, your Honor.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Yes. Is the victim impact statement publicly filed? Should I refer to him by his last name or by Athlete-2?

THE COURT: Let me ask Mr. Mead. I know you sent it by email to my chambers: (a) can it be filed on the docket, and (b) do you need to redact certain things from the docket and would you prefer that the victim be referred to as Athlete-2?

MR. MEAD: My understanding is that the victim would

prefer to be referred to as Athlete-2. It's my understanding that the victim impact statements are frequently not filed on the docket at all and kept under seal, and we respectfully ask that the entirety of the victim impact statement be kept under seal.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: No objection.

THE COURT: All right. I think I do refer to the victim as Athlete-2, but as long as we're all on the same page as to whom victim number two, what it refers to, and I think we are.

All right. So let me ask, is there anything else I should have received that I have not mentioned, other than the consent order of restitution, which I have a copy of now?

MR. MEAD: Nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. From the defense?

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. First, let me ask

Mr. Marcus Amelkin, have you received a copy of the presentence
report?

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: I have.

THE COURT: And have you discussed it with your client?

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: I have.

THE COURT: Mr. Briscoe, have you received a copy of the presentence report?

1 THE DEFENDANT: I have.

02GRBRIs

THE COURT: Have you reviewed it with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And have you had time to point out any mistakes or errors or things that you believe should be brought up with me or with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: All right. Let me ask Mr. Marcus Amelkin, do you have any objections to the report?

MR. AMELKIN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Mead, does the government have any objections?

MR. MEAD: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: So I am going to adopt the factual findings in the report, and the report will be made part of the record in this case. It will be placed under seal. However, if an appeal is taken, counsel on the appeal can have copies of the report without further application to me or one of my colleagues.

So Mr. Briscoe, you may recall back when you pled guilty that I referred to a set of guidelines called the sentencing guidelines. Now, those are guidelines that were created to assist judges like myself when we impose sentence. At a certain point in time, those guidelines were mandatory, which would have meant I would have had to apply them in just

about every case. However, they are no longer mandatory. I still, as a matter of law, must consult them in determining what an appropriate sentence is for you.

So part of that process includes me doing my own independent calculation of the guideline range that applies in your case. So first, the crime to which you're charged, the guideline range -- actually could you hold on one moment?

I apologize. I just have to go back into the robing room for a second. I'll be right back.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Thank you, your Honor.

(Recess)

02GRBRIs

THE COURT: Nothing quite like the government servers weren't working so the document I had been working on disappeared, but we've recovered it. All right.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Good.

THE COURT: So I think I was asking Mr. Briscoe, have you read the presentence report and gone over it with your attorney? Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And you had an opportunity to go over any mistakes or things that you felt should be added to the report with him?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I think I'm repeating myself, but do you have any objections to the report, Mr. Marcus

Amelkin?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Mead?

MR. MEAD: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: As I was saying, I adopt the findings in the presentence report. The report will be made part of the record, and it will be placed under seal. And attorneys on any appeal will not have to apply to me or one of my colleagues to get a copy. They will have access to it.

Now, as I mentioned, Mr. Briscoe, you may recall that I mentioned a set of quidelines, and I believe I was about to start that quideline calculation when I realized that the materials I had were not the ones that I should have had. you are charged with a conspiracy under Title 18, United States Code, Section 371. The applicable guideline for that statute is 2X1.1. Since you conspired to commit wire fraud, the applicable guideline is 2B1.1, and that's the guideline for conspiracy to commit wire fraud. Because the offense of conviction does not have a statutory maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years or more, the base offense level is six. Because the total loss is more than \$550,000 but less than \$1.5 million; specifically, the loss here was \$1 million, 14 levels are added. Your adjusted offense level, therefore, becomes 20. That offense level is reduced by three for your acceptance of responsibility, making your total offense level

of 17. You do qualify for the zero-point offender reduction, which reduces your guideline range by two additional points, to make it a level. You have no criminal history points, so your criminal history category is I. So based on a total offense level of 15, criminal history category of I, your guideline is 18 to 24 months' imprisonment. Do the parties agree that Mr. Briscoe's guideline range is 18 to 24' months imprisonment?

MR. MEAD: Yes, your Honor.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I note that my calculations are consistent with what is in the plea agreement as well as the presentence report. Now with regard to the applicability of any departures here, I recognize that I have the authority to depart, but I have reviewed the record, and I don't believe there are any bases for a departure. However, I do understand that I have the authority to grant a variance in this matter.

Now, Mr. Marcus Amelkin, in your submission to me, you suggest that a variance would be appropriate here and suggest that a noncustodial sentence based on Mr. Briscoe's background, personal history and characteristics, among other things, in essence, of a sentence of time serve. Probation recommends a sentence of eight months, and the government has recommended a sentence within the guideline range of 18 to 24 months.

Let me ask, does the government wish to be heard with regard to sentencing?

MR. MEAD: Just very briefly, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MEAD: This was a relevantly blatant fraud. The defendant took advantage of his relationship with Athlete-2, who trusted him. The defendant then forged his signature and used it to defraud Athlete-2 out of \$1 million, which is a lot of money. I think this is a sentence that calls for a jail term. I recognize the Court did not impose a jail term on Mr. Gilder. I think they are relatively similarly situated in that they are both at the bottom of culpability scale in this case. I think that this was in some ways -- I don't want to distinguish them too much, but for the reasons stated, I do think that a jail sentence is appropriate. And I'm happy to answer any questions of the Court.

THE COURT: Okay. First, on the first page of government's submission, it states that Athlete-2 provided 77 percent of the funding for Agency-1, which leaves 23 percent. Mr. Marcus Amelkin, in his submission, indicated that a part of that 23, or maybe all of it, was a contribution by Mr. Briscoe, which represented a commission that he received from another client or some other business matter. Do you know or do you have a sense of what that other 23 percent was made of?

MR. MEAD: It did come from other athletes. I think Mr. Marcus Amelkin is correct. I know the money came from

other athletes, and I think it did come because of Mr. Briscoe's role as those other athletes' agent.

THE COURT: Okay. And whose idea was it to form Agency-1?

MR. MEAD: I'm not sure. I'm not sure that that it was this defendant's idea. I think it was partially the idea of Mr. Cohen. I think it was mainly the idea of Mr. Cohen. I think Athlete-2 had some interest in the idea as well though, and I think the facts about Agency — well, those facts about the financial aspects of Agency-1, I think are useful background for the Court in understanding the relationship, but they are also not the core of the fraud here.

THE COURT: Yes. Also, on the first page, it states that Briscoe informed Athlete-2 that a highly touted athlete preparing for the NBA draft, Athlete-6, had signed with Briscoe and Agency-1. How was that communicated? Do you know?

MR. MEAD: I think there are certainly text messages about it, your Honor. And then, there's ultimately a signed — there's a standard player—agent contract in the NBA, and ultimately, the defendant transmits what purports to be a fully executed version of that signed player agent contract to Athlete—2, I think, again, by text message.

THE COURT: I guess what I'm getting at, because in Mr. Marcus Amelkin's submission, there's a reference to I think it was maybe Mr. Darden's indicating to Mr. Briscoe that

Athlete-6 was interested in signing up with an agency with Mr. Briscoe; either that agency or Agency-1, but I think it was Mr. Briscoe's agency. And there appears to be some suggestion that somehow Mr. Briscoe thought that maybe Athlete-6 was going to join, and because then it refers to I think later on speaks to Athlete-2 about the possibility of Athlete-6 joining the agency. I'm just trying to clear up that.

MR. MEAD: Sure, your Honor. I think perhaps some larger background about the case might be helpful.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MEAD: Mr. Darden is a repeat fraudster.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MEAD: Several fraud convictions.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MEAD: Mr. Briscoe and Mr. Darden were charged together with this part of the scheme and also the WNBA team part of the scheme.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MEAD: And the government's view in some of the documents seized at the time of arrest indicated that

Mr. Darden may have been lying to Mr. Briscoe about some aspects of that scheme. Therefore, we decided to back off the allegations against Mr. Mr. Briscoe in that dispute. I don't think there's any dispute that Mr. Darden may have lied to

Mr. Briscoe at times. The government, obviously, has limited

insight into kind of the relationships between coconspirators at times. In this case, we spoke with Athlete-6. Athlete-6 said, I have no idea what you're talking about. I never talked to any of these people. I have never heard of any of these people. I was never close to signing up with them. I never knew I was supposed to get a loan.

What we know for absolute certainty about

Mr. Briscoe's involvement is that he forged this signature of

Athlete-6. It is, I suppose, possible that he believed from

Mr. Darden that, you know, this was going to happen anyway, and

he was just forging it to speed things up or something like

that. Obviously, he still represented to Athlete-2 that this

was a real signature, and that was the basis for getting the

money. So it's a little bit hard for the government to know

exactly what was going on there, but I don't think any of that

takes away too much from Mr. Briscoe's involvement in this case

and the fake signature.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I mean, that is helpful, I guess. But I take it from what you're saying that there are no text or email messages or things where you can see the progression? I think you are right in terms of at the end of the day -- well, let me ask, I'm not sure what the significance of this is, but in the defense submission, they refer to an IP address from which it came rather than saying -- I'm not sure if there's a suggestion that someone else sent it

from the IP address. First of all, do you know what IP address it came from, the contract with the fraudulent signatures?

MR. MEAD: So again, I'm doing this a little bit from memory.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. MEAD: The fraudulent signature was done digitally. It was done through a service called DocuSign.

DocuSign records don't tie to an IP address. They tie to email addresses, and they show that Mr. Briscoe's email address is the email address that was used to sign on behalf of Athlete-6.

THE COURT: Let me ask Mr. Marcus Amelkin, you refer to an IP address, why?

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: The truth of the matter is that Mr. Briscoe doesn't remember forging the signature, but he accepts that he did it and accepts responsibility for it. You know, in my presentation, I'll go through this, but Darden was constantly running scams on him, and it's hard for him to remember exactly who did what when. But the bottom line is that he never met Athlete-6 or Athlete-6's mother, and he sent a document that didn't have their real signatures on it to Athlete-2.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: And this is certain that he remembers doing, which is that the loan amount that Mr. Darden told him was for \$900,000, and Mr. Briscoe asked Athlete-2 for

\$1 million. Now, I think that's also mitigated by the fact that he thought that their agencies were merging, and he needed money for overhead costs, not for personal use, but he didn't tell that to Athlete-2.

And so, I think one of the main arguments we'll have is his early acceptance of responsibility in a case that was probably triable is, I think, an mitigating fact for Mr. Briscoe in this instance.

MR. MEAD: Just one additional brief point on that, your Honor?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. MEAD: I want to kind of emphasize how unusual it would be for an NBA agent to sign up a player without even having met them or talked to them.

THE COURT: Well, what I'll say is, it would be unusual, especially since it's a young person and the person's parents are there. There's no way that a parent isn't going to be somehow involved in that, you know, if they are on the scene. So I recognize that it would be very unusual for it not to happen, especially when you are talking about the amount of money that sometimes is connected with these type of contracts.

So as I understand it, the proof of the forged signature is that it came from Mr. Briscoe's email address, and it utilized the DocuSign in order to do the signatures. So did it actually have an actual signature of these individuals? It

just said signed by or?

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Right. It's like when you type Judge Broderick after the slash S.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MEAD: The victim impact statement is actually DocuSigned. That's a real one, but that's basically what it looks like.

THE COURT: All right. Although, you see in the one from Athlete-2, there appears to be -- it said DocuSigned by, and then there's squiggles and underneath it, it says the name. Do you have to have the squiggles, I guess for lack of a better -- what I want to determine is: Was there ever a use or did the government ever suspect that there was a use of actual signatures of Athlete-6 and Athlete-6's mother, or was it just that DocuSign was used to basically type in their names?

MR. MEAD: I think the latter. I think there is a squiggle, but our understanding is that it was entirely made up by Mr. Briscoe, rather than copying an actual signature.

THE COURT: Do you know if Mr. Briscoe had any identifying information of either Athlete-6 or Athlete-6's mother?

MR. MEAD: I don't believe so, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. On page 2 of the government's submission, it says Briscoe used approximately \$306,642 of the funds to pay off a prior debt, and wired approximately \$544,000

to the bank account controlled by Darden. The first question I have is: Do you know of that \$306,642, what that debt was?

MR. MEAD: I suspect Mr. Amelkin does. I have a vague memory that there was -- I want to be clear that I'm not sure that this is right.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MEAD: I have a vague memory that someone was considering investing in or purchasing one of Mr. Briscoe's companies, made a down payment, and then wanted the money back and that that was what this money was. But, again, that's from memory. I'm not 100 percent sure about that, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And the 544 went to Mr. Darden's account. Do you know what the balance of it was? Because when I added it up, it didn't add up to \$1 million.

MR. MEAD: I think the remaining 140 or so or maybe 100, the defendant kept.

THE COURT: Okay. So it was the 306 Mr. Briscoe used in connection with paying off a debt. 544 went to Mr. Darden's account, and the balance Mr. Briscoe used in connection with --well, Mr. Briscoe kept. Do you know what he did with that?

MR. MEAD: I don't recall, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MEAD: Essentially, our view is they came close to splitting the money. Darden got a little bit more than half.

Briscoe got about 450. He needed to spend two-thirds of that

to pay off a debt, and then he kept the remaining 150 or so.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Do you want me to respond to that now in terms of taking it in order?

THE COURT: If you want, that's fine.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Yes, just on this point, we don't dispute he kept the rest. The 306 he paid to a prominent business person who was planning to invest in his sports agency that he was paying back. But he believed that that amount of money, the 306, was going to be added to the 544 and be sent to Athlete-6. He still believed at that point that he was signing Athlete-6.

THE COURT: What is the proof of that?

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Just proffer. But also there's multiple -- I think that there's a lot of circumstantial evidence that points to it, which is that Mr. Briscoe believed he was merging with Athlete-2's new agency. He was really excited about it. It was to his benefit to do so given Athlete-2's connections. And even after Athlete-6 signed with his real agency, Darden told Mr. Briscoe that that agency was interested in merging with Athlete-2's new agency.

THE COURT: Let me ask, did Athlete-2 know that Mr. Briscoe viewed the business transaction with Agency-1 as a merger with his agency?

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Yes, of course. I think
Athlete-2 knew that, because Cohen and Athlete-2 recruited

Briscoe to be the lead agent for this new agency.

THE COURT: That's because Athlete-2 couldn't be the agent, right?

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Well, not only that, it's also because they liked Mr. Briscoe and wanted to work with him, and Mr. Briscoe wanted to work with them. You know, before this case, Mr. Briscoe was a respected member of this community, and it makes sense that they were interested in him. And I'll note that the relationship between Athlete-2 and Mr. Briscoe even continued after this Athlete-6 business fell apart. When Athlete-2 was injured, you know, effectively ending his playing career, Athlete-2 asked Mr. Briscoe to be an expert witness for him in the civil deposition to determine the lost wages he was likely to have, and Mr. Briscoe agreed to do so.

Also, once Mr. Briscoe realized that this was all a sham, he offered to pay Athlete-2 what he had in his business accounts. And Athlete-2 said at that point that he was already suing Cohen, and he was going to get it back that way. So there was an offer to pay back Athlete-2, and I think the reason why he wanted to was because he felt terrible about how this whole thing went down and really ashamed and embarrassed that he messed this up. And I think what is key to this whole thing is that this fake Trevor Steven individual, this cousin of Athlete-2.

MR. MEAD: Athlete-6.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Athlete-6, this cousin of Athlete-6. So let's take a step back on this. Baldwin, I'm sorry, not Stevens.

So Athlete-6 played college for a prominent prior NBA player, so I'm not going to identify everybody's names here.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: It would just identify Athlete-6. And that coach/former athlete has a best friend who is a prominent lawyer in the city where Athlete-6 played basketball. And this lawyer, who actually later went to jail for his own issues, Darden told Briscoe that the lawyer approached him and said that he was interested in signing with Briscoe. And then, Darden introduced him to Baldwin, who purported to be Athlete-6's cousin, and Briscoe hired Baldwin, this fake cousin, to work at the agency as a way to grease the wheels of signing Athlete-6, which is pretty common in this space.

All of that to say is that the record is pretty muddy about his mens rea and what he knew and when he knew it. But I think what's clear is that he knew that he was being dishonest with Athlete-2 about the signatures, and he knew he was being dishonest with Athlete-2 about the amount of the loan that Athlete-6 requested. But I think there's strong circumstantial evidence, especially the Brady disclosure to the government, that there were lies told to Mr. Briscoe and lies told about this scheme as well to induce Mr. Briscoe to act.

THE COURT: But at a certain point he knew that -when Athlete-6 signed with another, he knew that this was just
a scam. Well, we'll get back to it. Thank you for that
clarification. I just have a few more questions for the
government, and then I'll ask to hear from you.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Thank you, your Honor. Sorry for the long interlude.

THE COURT: No, that's okay.

So I think I covered the next question I had, which was the referencing of the defense submission that in November 2019 Calvin Darden, Jr., told Mr. Briscoe that a highly touted college player, Athlete-6, wanted to sign with his agency, but that Athlete-6 was asking for a \$900,000 loan. And then it says it was not uncommon. So I think I've gotten the explanation related to that. So I think for now, I don't have any additional questions, so I'll turn to Mr. Marcus Amelkin.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Thank you, your Honor. Did you want to start with questions or should I begin?

THE COURT: Well, my understanding is that it's in the proffer that your client doesn't remember signing these documents and sending them from his email to Athlete-2.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: That's right. We both have lamented that we kind of prefer -- we wish that he remembered because we want to take full responsibility for his actions,

but for me to stand up and say that he did it when he doesn't remember it, I think would be disingenuous.

THE COURT: Understood. I'm just curious --

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Yes.

THE COURT: -- because this seems to be a pretty big deal in the sense that there was a combination of things, right. There's the Agency-1. There's this prominent athlete. There's the whole thing coming together.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: If you want my take on it from reviewing discovery, talks with the government, talking, you know, with Mr. Briscoe a lot. You know, we talked a lot in this case, you know. I think that there was a lot of pleasure from Darden to get the deal done to get this \$1 million, and what Darden was telling Briscoe was that you have to get this money because we'll get Athlete-6 this way --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: -- and he signed it because he believed that he would be able to clean it up later. But then, before that happened, the scam was revealed.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: And I'll just note that he then, after it happened, voluntarily resigned as an agent, like basically closed his business in disgrace, well before he was charged for this crime, and started to restart his life because he realized that at that point, his career would be effectively

over given the mistake that he made in associating with Darden but also what happened with Athlete-2 and 6. He just knew that -- in my view, he was taking responsibility before he took legal responsibility for his actions.

THE COURT: Well, what I'll say, right, your reputation takes a lifetime to build up and just, you know, different people have said different amounts of time, but it takes mere seconds to destroy.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: I agree with that, and I think that that is -- it's emblematic of this case. And that's why, I think, when we talk about the offense conduct, which is serious that there is significant collateral consequences here that far exceed a typical case because of the reputational harm, his loss of his business and the fact that he will now have a felony conviction, which will close the door from many job opportunities that might have been available to him prior to his pleading guilty.

I think that his early acceptance of responsibility, him and Gilder both, I think, got in the door the same week to plead. He didn't plead after he learned this Gilder pleaded. He learned they both had already accepted plea agreements. Gilder just went first. That's a mitigating fact in this case. Of course, acceptance to responsibility is always important and may result in a lesser sentence, but here where we have a pretty shocking Brady demand from the jump in this case, in

that one of two cases he is charged with, the government is basically abandoning because the evidence makes clear that Darden was likely deceiving him.

I think at that point many a client that has as much to lose as Mr. Briscoe would say let's go to trial and fight this thing to the end. I do feel like -- we feel like he was a victim of Darden's manipulation and lies, but instead,
Mr. Briscoe felt that the better course of action was to accept responsibility early and agree to a felony conviction plea agreement. I really hoped that we could avoid a felony, but we didn't in this case. And I think that by pleading to a felony early and not requiring the government to prepare to go to trial when the two main codefendants are digging in and appear to be pushing in that direction, and I imagine that Darden has to go given his -- I think this will be his third or fourth federal fraud conviction. Third, I think.

THE COURT: I'm not sure. I know of at least one, but yes, which actually raises another question.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Right. Well, I think it raises that Mr. Briscoe is naive. How did he not Google him and realize --

THE COURT: I think I Googled him early on in this case. The first page of the results basically has the article that you reference.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: There's no question. And what is

interesting about that is what Mr. Briscoe said is that there were times, you know, when he was unsure about Darden, but he kept coming through in these odd ways. Like, Darden introduced Mr. Briscoe to Kanye West before he fell off the earth, like was one of the biggest stars in the world. He introduced him to his father --

THE COURT: Before or after the Grammy incident?

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Right, who knows. Post Yeezus

pre Yeezus is God.

THE COURT: I understand, you know.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: But introduced him to his father, Charles Darden, Sr., who was on the board of Coca-Cola, all this stuff. Mr. Briscoe felt he was legit. He knew all these famous people. It was good for business to know famous people, and as a result, he ruined his entire life, my client, at least his business life.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's, you know, I'll just say it, and then I'll have some questions. Look, it's a snapshot in a relatively young man's life --

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Yes.

THE COURT: -- so no matter what happens here, and it's the reason why the folks here are supporting you,

Mr. Briscoe. It seems like from the submissions that you've taken certain steps in your life to try and, you know, turn things around. I understand what you're saying, Mr. Marcus

Amelkin.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: I recognize in terms of his business career, what he was doing as an agent, yeah, it was a significant blow so that obviously.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Thank you.

Just to close with some final points I wanted to make about the offense conduct. Number one, the government concedes and, of course, I think it's appropriate that Mr. Briscoe and Mr. Gilder are similarly situated. I'll also note that Mr. Gilder, probation recommended a year and a day. In this case, they only recommended eight months for Mr. Briscoe.

Mr. Gilder had a higher loss amount, and the Court sentenced Mr. Gilder to time served, which --

THE COURT: Hold on. This is maybe in the vagaries of the way back when the schemes went down, but all of the money, he waived everything before he came in and was sentenced. So no one was owed any money, and I understand what part of that has to do with someone's different circumstances, and at times, you have no control over that. I'll just leave it at that.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Fair enough. I'm note to that point, Mr. Briscoe does have \$500 today to pay towards restitution. Actually, that's the first time that I've had that happen at a sentencing in a fraud case to have the client try to scrape together money to pay it back. It's clear that

Mr. Briscoe's life was not particularly enriched by this. He lost his home. His cars were repossessed. His family is in great debt, and it seems like Darden and Cohen got to live on the high horse from this money, at least according to the PSR.

THE COURT: I will just say that everything comes to an end.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: There's no question of that.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. That was with regard to Mr. Darden.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: I understood what you meant, your Honor. I hope it comes to an end for Mr. Briscoe. I think it's been very hard on him and his wife that they've had to move in with her sister and live off of her generosity. And I think it demonstrates their recognition and their willingness to take responsibility for this crime by not trying to continue to live off of loans or debt or whatever, but instead try to rebuild the right way.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: So that closes the loop, I think, the offense conduct. You know, the government agrees that Mr. Briscoe invested in the business. Mr. Briscoe was excited to work with Athlete-2, and he really feels terrible for what he did to both ruin that business relationship as well as for the misstatements he made to Athlete-2. But I think that his history and characteristics, regardless of, you know, if the

Court believes that the crime itself is deserving of punishment of some form of incarceration, mitigates that need here.

This is an individual who, I think, is a pretty inspirational person, and I admire his efforts and his — both to succeed when he was younger and now to rebuild his life. I think his mother's letter was really beautiful. It really painted a picture — and they wrote it together, painted the picture of a life that he was raised in. To go from a town of 200 people in rural Arkansas to become a 20-year-old NBA agent without any connections to the business. His first client was a signee out of his home state. And just building relationships with these young men, signing them, getting first-round draft picks.

His mother told me this is the first time she's ever been in New York, and I think it's devastating that she's not here to accompany him to the NBA draft or some business event but instead is here for today. And I think that that story is inspirational and the loss of that career is hard, but what I admire is that both Mr. Briscoe and his wife have really leaned into their faith in this trying time. You know, they prayed in the courthouse before they came in, and they've written a devotional book that they are going to probably get published. They go to church every week, and every night he has a streak going of almost a year of daily prayer, which has fortified him and his family in this difficult time.

I think that his children and the special bond that he has with them is extremely mitigating and warrants serious consideration. I thought the letter from his child's school was really impressive, that he goes every week and volunteers, spends the whole day at the school through their watch dogs program. No matter where he was for work, even if he was meeting with a client in California, every day, he was home for bedtime to put those kids to sleep. So a prison sentence would be absolutely devastating.

I think his health is an important concern in this case. I'll make that argument in combination with the current conditions in the Bureau of Prisons. The Bureau of Prisons, when it operates functionally, is difficult for people with special diets, and right now I think there's a real danger to his health given the short-staffed countrywide problem of not having enough correctional officers or civilian staff. You know, nutrition is definitely one of the things that has fallen by the wayside. I have received letters from clients all over the country complaining about expired food, warm meals that were served really cold. No warm meals for long stretches of time because they are locked down because there isn't staff. And I think if you have a stomach condition that can leave you hospitalized, the need for treatment is an important consideration in this case.

And finally, the last consideration is the need to pay

restitution. We take issue with Athlete-2's letter just to the extent that Mr. Briscoe is fully dedicated to paying back this money. I think it's likely that, at least in the short term, he may be the only one paying. He is willing to have his wages garnished once he starts making them and to pay back Athlete-2, because he would not feel whole if he did not do so. He's only 36 years old, and I think that there's a good chance that a large portion of this money will be repaid as long as he gets back on his feet and is able to work. I think a prison sentence would delay that as well as hamper his ability to find meaningful and well-paid work. I think it would make future employers more concerned about hiring him if the Court was to impose a custodial sentence.

If the Court is inclined to punish him beyond the serious collateral consequences that a felony conviction and the restitution and the supervised release would provide, we would ask that he be required to be detained at home or serve community service or some other non-incarceratory sentence.

But at the same time, Mr. Briscoe is a homebody anyway. He's not going anywhere, so I don't think it's necessary in this case. But I will throw it out there just in the event that that is something that the Court is considering.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me ask, the 23 percent, the commission, was that all from Mr. Briscoe for Agency-1 or a substantial portion or do you know not exactly?

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: He signed an extension for one of his clients, which was a fairly lucrative extension, and he put the entire commission amount into Agency-1.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Whether that equals to 23 percent, I didn't look at the books.

THE COURT: All right. Now, you mentioned in your submission that Mr. Briscoe was financially struggling. Let me go back the \$306,000, so I take it, there was a down payment. The investor decided not to invest in the agency, and so Mr. Briscoe owed the money back; is that what occurred?

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Let me just clarify?

THE COURT: Yes, go right ahead.

(Counsel and defendant conferred)

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: All right. So now I understand. So the investor gave the \$300,000 because he wanted to buy a piece of Briscoe Sports Group. But when Agency-1 was created and Mr. Briscoe agreed to be the lead agent, he backed out of the deal with the businessman, so he had to pay him back.

(Counsel and defendant conferred)

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: And Mr. Briscoe had loaned Mr. Darden a similar amount of money, that the businessman had given him for his sports agency, for a venture that Mr. Darden was working on, and so Mr. Briscoe believed that because Darden owed him that amount of money, he would take that amount of

02GRBRIs

money plus the rest of the \$544 and give it to Athlete-6. So basically, it was an end-around. Instead of A pay C, A pay B and B pay C.

THE COURT: All right. I think I missed the thread on the Darden piece. So there was \$300,000 or so from the businessman for Mr. Briscoe's agency. But then, Agency-1 came in and Mr. Briscoe stepped back from that, so he needed to pay him back. What money went to Mr. Darden, or did it go to Mr. Darden?

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: First off, the businessman and Mr. Darden and Mr. Briscoe negotiated the businessman's investment. Darden introduced the businessman to Mr. Briscoe.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Separate and apart from that agreement, Darden borrowed money from Mr. Briscoe in a similar amount.

THE COURT: So the \$300,000 didn't go from businessman to Mr. Briscoe and then Mr. Briscoe to Mr. Darden?

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: I think it was different money.

THE COURT: Okay. Got it.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: In a sense, yes, like if it's all one pot.

THE COURT: No, no. The reason I'm trying to figure out whether it was something that was simultaneous, I was going to ask what happened to the \$300,000 that the businessman gave

as part of the initial investment. It sounds like it was spent on other things.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: I think that's right. I think
Mr. Briscoe's business was struggling because he had a lot of
employees and a lot of overhead, and he wasn't able to keep up
with those costs. And that's what put him into financial
struggles, but Mr. Briscoe believed that because Mr. Darden
paid him a similar amount of money, that Mr. Briscoe paid to
the business man, because he assured him that he would; Darden,
he would give that portion of money to Athlete-6. So Briscoe
was taking --

THE COURT: To athlete-6 or --

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Yes, Athlete-6. The 544 plus the three something, he thought would add up to nine to go to Athlete-6 because he believed that that was the amount that Darden --

THE COURT: I see, for the loan. All right.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Yes. Exactly.

So again, I think it's mitigating as to the offense conduct even though it requires you to accept the defense's proffer that he believed that Athlete-6 was going to sign with him. This was in ought all some fake ruse to get Athlete-2 to give him \$1 million. And I think that it wouldn't make sense, in my opinion, for -- if that was the plan, why he would give so much of it to Darden when Mr. Briscoe is the one who induced

Athlete-2 to give this money.

THE COURT: Let me ask, in terms of a couple things on page 10. There's a reference to, last year judges in this district sentenced defendants convicted of fraud below the guideline 78.9 percent of the cases.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: First, I think it's actually for fiscal year 2022, so it's not actually 2023.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Yes, that's a typo. I'm sorry, your Honor.

THE COURT: No, it's fine. And this is something, the 78.9 percent, my reading of it, is an aggregation of not only the variances but also departures under 5K1.1.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Yes, 8 percent were 5K departures and 70.9 percent were variances.

THE COURT: All right. The only thing I ask in the future, and if you can spread this to your office because it happened in another case where a Federal Defender was involved; you need to be clear in the submission that it's separate. It doesn't matter for me because I'm going to look at that, but I'm not sure every judge is going to look at that. Well, it's not, at least in my mind, there's a difference, right, because the folks, what you're talking about for your clients, typically is a variance. The aggregation, I think, even though it's a small percentage, you understand what I'm saying?

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: I think it's a fair criticism and one I will take back to the office. I used to do this paragraph longer, but it was so busy that I took out the granularity. But I understand the Court's point and will do so in the future.

THE COURT: Or just refer to the variance.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Yes. The number was still very high, so it doesn't take anything away from it.

THE COURT: Although, it does vary because the year before it was 60-something.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: 67. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Briscoe, would you like to be heard?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. You can remain seated if you want. Just pull the microphone closer. Go ahead.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you for allowing me to speak. First off, I would like to say I'm sorry for taking up your time today. I would like to say I'm sorry to the victims that I've hurt and caused the pain and suffering in their lives. You know, I wake up every day with regret for everything that I've done to lead me to this point today. I remember about almost a year now, on March the 23rd when I was arrested, and I didn't know what to do. The only thing I could think about was to pray to God. It's because of God's strength that I'm here today. My family, you know, because of them, also, I'm

embarrassed for my community, my family, my kids.

I'm sorry that I caused this pain. And like I said, you know, I started -- when I prayed to God, I asked him to help me get through, and I started praying. The first thing I do in the morning is pray to God. The last thing I do when I wake up is pray to God because. The person that you guys are reading about and actions I made for the mistakes in a brief period in my life, that wasn't me. So I ask the Court today if they would in part view me as my life as a whole because, you know, I try to do things the right way because I have a lot of people that look up to me, even people that I didn't know that looked up to me. And it's through this time that, you know, God sat me down and showed me the impact that I could have on other peoples' lives just by doing things the right way, by helping in the community, just by giving back. Not only that but just trying to be a positive role model.

I realize that, and it's part because of my devotion and the time that I've spent, it's been 320 days that I've been getting up, reading the devotionals, listening to God, praying to him and actually reading the Bible. I've been inspired and it inspired me to write a devotional with my wife. It helps me to deal with the regret and the pain that I caused the victims. And I know that one day that I can help and make amends, you know, to them for this pain that I caused. And I hope that they can, you know, accept my apologies.

I know that, you know, right now things are -- it seems bad, but at the end of the day, you know, this is not me. Who I am standing in front of you today is who I truly am, and like I said, I'm truly sorry. I'm sorry for rambling on, but I thank you for your time and I thank you for just hearing me out.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Let me ask, is there any reason why sentence should not be imposed at this time?

MR. MEAD: No, your Honor.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: As I stated and the parties agree,

Mr. Briscoe's guideline range is 18 to 24 months. Under the

Supreme Court's decision in Booker and its progeny, the

guideline range is just one factor that I must consider in

deciding what an appropriate sentence is. I'm also required to

consider the other factors set forth in 18, United States Code,

Section 3553(a), and I have done so. Those factors include but

are not limited to: The nature and circumstances of the

offense and the personal history and characteristics of

Mr. Briscoe since each defendant must be treated as an

individual.

I am also required to consider the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, provide just punishment for the

offense, provide adequate deterrence to criminal chuck and avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities among other things. First, I'll address the circumstances of the offense. There's no question you've been convicted of a serious offense. Conspiracy to commit wire fraud is a serious offense, and here it involved \$1 million from Athlete-2 and the signing of fraudulent signatures of Athlete-6. And once you received that money, you used the money to pay off a debt, and then sent \$544,000 to Mr. Darden. But none of that money eventually made its way to Athlete-6 as had been represented to Athlete-2.

Later when Athlete-2 inquired about getting paid what he thought was a loan, he was again put off and told, we're going to get it. We're going to get it. So I recognize it's what I'll say is more murky than I initially anticipated in the sense that I think the best gloss on it would be that there may have been some representation by Mr. Darden, but there was never any communication by yourself or anyone else with Athlete-6. And it was clear, to me at least, that Athlete-2 believed that there already was this connection. And I wasn't about a possibility or they may sign or anything like that.

And for whatever reason at the time of your life, you were trying to right the ship of your business, and you owed a lot of money and this was a way of getting it and perhaps

Mr. Darden. But at the end of the day, you fraudulently signed, based upon the evidence before me, fraudulently signed

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

folks names, having never spoken with them, for a loan that basically wasn't a loan.

So that's a serious offense. And to the point that you've made in your statement as well as in the submission, it was a breach of trust. I know you're aware of this. I mean, according to your submission, you were the youngest person to become a registered agent. I think it summarized the breach of trust, at least from my perspective, in something that your parents said in their letter, which is true and it will continue to be true for you because you can still be a role model to people. But your folks said, After several years, he finally got his first first-round draft pick. This is about It was huge for not only him but those who looked up to Then when we got another first round draft pick and was him. invited to sit in the green room, those kids were able to see someone who looked like them and that came from where they came from to see that anything was possible and that their dreams could also be a reality.

Now, I don't know, I don't have a sense of Athlete-2, but I imagine that many of the folks you were dealing with were dealing with you in part because they recognized you as somewhat of a kindred spirit. Some of that is based upon the fact that, I imagine, certain of your clients were black and you're black, and they trusted in that and they wanted to do business with you. And so, I recognize that. And that was,

you know, in part what I think you were referring to about letting folks down.

Now, next I'll address your history and characteristics. In that regard, I've read the sentencing submission. I've read all the letters that have been submitted to me. You and your siblings were raised in Winchester, Arizona.

THE DEFENDANT: Arkansas.

THE COURT: Arkansas, I'm sorry. I was making the same mistake last night when I was reading through it. A town of 200 people. I actually looked it up and Wikipedia had it in the 2010 census at about 179, so small town. You told the probation officers that your folks worked multiple jobs to make ends meet for your family. And that for a time your father worked as a farmer as well as working at a welding company, and your mom worked in the fast food industry. But because of their hard work, your basic needs were always met and your sibling's were always met, and your family was never without shelter or utilities.

You worked with your dad for a while on the farm, and you credit that with your appreciation for what it means to work in manual labor and that motivated you to excel in school. And your parents, obviously, support you, and they supported you because I read their letter. And they supported you when you were younger, and it really drove you to try and do what

you did. In other words, to follow your passion, which was sports, and to try and make a career out of that.

Now, your family and friends describe you as a loving, caring father, husband and friend. They also say over the years, you've given back to the community by — you know, when your business was doing well, having Christmas meals for the community as well as various giveaways and things like that at Christmas time. Oh, and you also volunteer at your daughter's school and have done so even before the crime here. And each of them expressed surprise that you were involved in this — in the criminal activity.

So I'm going to take their views of your character into consideration in determining what an appropriate sentence is for you. Your family and friends also commented on what a good father you are to your daughter and your son, and described how involved you are in their lives. And it sounds as if you were involved before this incident and perhaps you are involved even more so now. And so I'll take account of your family circumstances, including the impact your incarceration might have on your family in determining what an appropriate sentence is for you.

However, I do note that, you know, your situation is different than many of the defendants I have who appear before. Well, similar in the sense that there is always collateral damage in these circumstances; in other words, where family

members, husbands, wives and children are collateral damage of a defendant's criminal acts. You know, I also note that obviously several of the folks who wrote on your behalf are here and that you will continue to have support. And I'll also take into consideration the fact that you have a medical issue that you suffer from. I guess I would say a chronic medical issue that occasionally flares up, and in your circumstance, unlike some others, when it flares up, it has been at times severe for you, at least once resulting in your hospitalization and need for surgery. And I think at some point, a perforation from what you had, another procedure. So I'll take that into consideration as to what an appropriate sentence is for you.

Mr. Briscoe, if you could please rise as I sentence.

I'm going to grant what your attorney has requested and give

you a sentence of time served. You can be seated. I can tell

you that I was going to give you jail time. You can be seated.

I was going to give you jail time, but my discussion and the

answers to my questions about how this all came about changed

my view somewhat of the conduct.

There's no question you just pocketed this money, and there's no question that at a time when you had an opportunity to basically, you know, sort of turn away from what had transpired, that didn't happen. It may be that you were thinking that you were going to get the money from somewhere, do whatever to sort of work out, but that didn't happen. I'm

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

going to give you three years of supervised release, the first six months to be spent on home detention.

With regard to supervised release, you'll be subject to the mandatory conditions on page 34 of the presentence The standard conditions on page 34 and 35 and the special conditions described in the PSR on pages 35 and 36. Those conditions include a risk condition, so that if a probation officer determines that you pose a risk to another, including an organization, the officer, with prior approval from me or one of my colleagues, may require you to notify that person or entity about the risk, and you must comply with that In other words, you are going to work for a instruction. company and you are going to be dealing with money, there may be a situation where the probation officer will request, well, the employer or whomever needs to be notified of the risk. not saying that that is going to happen, but that's basically what it means in the context.

You must not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer unless you are already in compliance with the installment payment schedule. You must provide access to any financial documents that the probation officer may ask about. You'll also be subject to a search condition, and that's of your person, your home and the like, on reasonable suspicion by the probation officer. What that means is there could be a

search conducted, so you should inform the folks that you live with that there's a possibility at some point that there may be such a search.

Now, with regard to restitution, there is a restitution order. Let me ask, Mr. Briscoe, did you sign this restitution order earlier today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And have you read it and gone over it with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to sign the restitution order. The forfeiture order had already been entered or filed on November 9, so that has been taken care of.

Yes, Mr. Marcus Amelkin?

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Thank you. As to the restitution, would the Court mark on the judgment that interest is waived because he is indigent?

THE COURT: I typically do, and I will in this case.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: So the forfeiture was in the amount of \$1,571,000, and that forfeiture is imposed if I needed to do it orally; although, I believe it's already in a document.

Mr. Briscoe you will not have to pay a fine. I find that you do not have the wherewithal to pay a fine. You must, however,

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

pay a \$100 special assessment, which is mandatory.

I believe that this sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes of sentencing set forth in 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a). Do either counsel know of any legal reason why this sentence should not be imposed as stated?

MR. MEAD: No, your Honor.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: No, your Honor. We thank the Court for the sentence.

THE COURT: Well, there's no need to thank you. I mean, it's my job.

The sentence as stated is imposed. Let me just say,
Mr. Briscoe, I imagine that your supervision is going to be
transferred, and I hope that you don't see you again. The only
thing I'll say is no matter what circumstances you're in, you
should avoid shortcuts, right? No matter what you tell
yourself, Oh, I'll make it up. I'll pay it back. I'll do
this. I'll do that. I can't tell you the number of folks I
see, especially in financial crimes, bank tellers who say, I'll
take this money but I'll pay it back. It's not going to
happen. It typically doesn't happen. If it seems too good to
be true, it usually is.

Now, you have a right to appeal your conviction and sentence in the sense that it is inconsistent with your plea agreement. The notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of the judgment of conviction. If you are not able to pay the

cost of appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. If you request, the Clerk of Court will file a notice of appeal on your behalf.

Mr. Briscoe, as I said, I hope I don't see you again, and I wish you luck. I hope you do right by the people here supporting and who wrote on your behalf and your kids.

So I am going to dismiss any underlying counts or indictments related to Mr. Briscoe. Anything else from the government?

MR. MEAD: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. From the defense?

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Yes, your Honor, two matters.

The first is we'd request -- I would request that you would put on the record, because he is going to be supervised in Texas as opposed to in New York, that home detention means he is permitted to leave for work, religious, volunteer work, or for medical but has to remain home for everything else.

THE COURT: Okay. I will do that. Just to make sure I have it, it would allow, obviously, for religious, medical, work.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: School. He's not in school but in case he goes back or college or something.

THE COURT: For him?

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Yes.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: Just so you are clear, you can ask your probation officer for other requests without having to go to court is generally how it works on supervision. But the second request I'd like to make is if the Court could recommend that he be monitored on his phone as opposed to having to wear the ankle monitor. Given he's not a risk of flight and not going anywhere, they can ensure that he can be at home with the cell phone.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't know what the process is,

THE COURT: Okay. I don't know what the process is, but I'll make the recommendation. But it is at the discretion of the probation office and the technology that they use for the situation and the comfort and the officers involved in the supervision.

MR. MARCUS AMELKIN: I respect that, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything else?

Okay. All right. We stand adjourned. Thank you very much.

(Adjourned)